

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The foregoing amendments are of formal nature, and do not add new matter. Their entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are pending in this application. Claims 47-48 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The instant claims have been amended for clarity. Further, Claim 44 has been amended with the functional recitation "wherein, the nucleic acid encoding said polypeptide is amplified in lung or colon tumors."

Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejections.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101/112, First Paragraph**

Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because, allegedly, "the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility." Claims 44-47 and 49-51 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, allegedly "since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention."

Regarding the Applicants' assertion of utility based on the gene amplification data, the Examiner quotes an exemplary reference like Haynes *et al.* to show that "the assertion is not supported by any factual evidence and is contrary to the conclusion of Haynes *et al.* which indicates that protein levels cannot be accurately predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript." Regarding the Azhkenazi declaration, the Examiner asserts that "the statements of Dr. Ashkenazi do not support a specific and substantial utility for the claimed protein .....use of the protein in the manner in which the Declaration asserts requires information which is lacking from the instant application; specifically, the expression levels of the encoded protein." For the reasons outlined below, Applicants respectfully disagree.

#### **Utility Guidelines**

According to the Utility Examination Guidelines ("Utility Guidelines"), 66 Fed. Reg. 1092 (2001) an invention complies with the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. §101, if it has at least one asserted "specific, substantial, and credible utility" or a "well-established utility."

Under the Utility Guidelines, a utility is “specific” when it is particular to the subject matter claimed. For example, it is generally not enough to state that a nucleic acid is useful as a diagnostic without also identifying the conditions that is to be diagnosed.

The requirement of “substantial utility” defines a “real world” use, and derives from the Supreme Court’s holding in *Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 534 (1966) stating that “The basic *quid pro quo* contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility.” In explaining the “substantial utility” standard, M.P.E.P. 2107.01 cautions, however, that Office personnel must be careful not to interpret the phrase “immediate benefit to the public” or similar formulations used in certain court decisions to mean that products or services based on the claimed invention must be “currently available” to the public in order to satisfy the utility requirement. “Rather, any reasonable use that an applicant has identified for the invention that can be viewed as providing a public benefit should be accepted as sufficient, at least with regard to defining a “substantial” utility.” (M.P.E.P. 2107.01, emphasis added.) Indeed, the Guidelines for Examination of Applications for Compliance with the Utility Requirement, set forth in M.P.E.P. 2107 II (B) (1) gives the following instruction to patent examiners: “If the (A)pplicant has asserted that the claimed invention is useful for any particular practical purpose . . . and the assertion would be considered credible by a person of ordinary skill in the art, do not impose a rejection based on lack of utility.”

Finally, the Utility Guidelines restate the Patent Office’s long established position that any asserted utility has to be “credible.” “Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record . . . that is probative of the Applicant’s assertions.” (M.P.E.P. 2107 II (B) (1) (ii)) Such standard is presumptively satisfied unless the logic underlying the assertion is seriously flawed, or if the facts upon which the assertion is based are inconsistent with the logic underlying the assertion (Revised Interim Utility Guidelines Training Materials, 1999).

To overcome the presumption of truth based on an assertion of utility by the Applicant, the Examiner must establish that **it is more likely than not** that one of ordinary skill in the art would doubt the truth of the statement of utility. **Absolute predictability is not a requirement.**

Only after the Examiner has made a proper *prima facie* showing of lack of utility, does the burden of rebuttal shift to the applicant. The issue will then be decided on the totality of evidence.

**A prima facie case of lack of utility has not been established**

The Examiner bases the assertion, that increases in gene copy number do not reliably correlate with increased gene expression or polypeptide expression, on exemplary literature like Haynes *et al.* and concludes that the instant PRO232 polypeptides lack utility.

According to the Examiner "Haynes *et al.* studied 80 proteins... and found no strong correlation between proteins and transcript levels." Applicants respectfully traverse and point out that, on the contrary, Haynes teaches that "**there was a general trend** but no strong correlation between protein [expression] and transcript levels" (Emphasis added). Haynes studied 80 *yeast* proteins to show that "protein levels cannot be **accurately** predicted from the level of the corresponding mRNA transcript" (Emphasis added) (see page 1863, paragraph 2.1, last line). For example, in Figure 1, there is a positive correlation between mRNA and protein amongst **most** of the 80 yeast proteins studied but the correlation is "not linear" and hence, "one cannot **accurately** predict protein levels from mRNA levels." In fact, very few data points deviated or scattered away from the expected normal or showed a lack of correlation between mRNA: protein levels. Thus, the Haynes data, meets the "more likely than not standard" and shows that a positive correlation exists between mRNA and protein. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection is based on a misrepresentation of the scientific data presented in Haynes *et al.* Since the standard is not "absolute certainty", a *prima facie* showing of lack of utility has not been made in this instance.

Further, Applicants submit supportive data to show that it is generally well-understood in the art that DNA copy number influences gene expression. For example, Orntoft *et al.* studied transcript levels of 5600 genes in malignant bladder cancers which were linked to a gain/loss of chromosomal material using an array-based method. Orntoft *et al.* showed that there was a gene dosage effect and teach that "in general (18 of 23 cases) chromosomal areas with more than 2-fold gain of DNA showed a corresponding increase in mRNA transcripts" (see column 1, abstract). In addition, Hyman *et al.* showed, using CGH analysis and cDNA microarrays to compare DNA copy numbers and mRNA expression of over 12,000 genes in breast cancer

tumors and cell lines, that there is "evidence of a prominent global influence of copy number changes on gene expression levels." (see page 6244, column 1, last paragraph). Additional supportive teachings are also provided by Pollack *et al.*, who studied a series of primary human breast tumors and showed that "...62% of highly amplified genes show moderately or highly elevated expression, and DNA copy number influences gene expression across a wide range of DNA copy number alterations (deletion, low-, mid- and high-level amplification), and that on average, a 2-fold change in DNA copy number is associated with a corresponding 1.5-fold change in mRNA levels." Thus, these articles collectively teach that gene amplification correspondingly increases mRNA expression, in general.

Further, enclosed is a Declaration by Dr. Polakis, principal investigator of the Tumor Antigen Project of Genentech, Inc., the assignee of the present application. As Dr. Polakis explains, the primary focus of the microarray project was to identify tumor cell markers useful as targets for both the diagnosis and treatment of cancer in humans. The scientists working on the project extensively rely on results of microarray experiments in their effort to identify such markers. As Dr. Polakis explains, using microarray analysis, Genentech scientists have identified approximately 200 gene transcripts (mRNAs) that are present in human tumor cells at significantly higher levels than in corresponding normal human cells. To date, they have generated antibodies that bind to about 30 of the tumor antigen proteins expressed from these differentially expressed gene transcripts and have used these antibodies to quantitatively determine the level of production of these tumor antigen proteins in both human cancer cells and corresponding normal cells. Having compared the levels of mRNA and protein in both the tumor and normal cells analyzed, they found a very good correlation between mRNA and corresponding protein levels. Specifically, in approximately 80% of their observations they have found that increases in the level of a particular mRNA correlates with changes in the level of protein expressed from that mRNA. While the proper legal standard is to show that the existence of correlation between mRNA and polypeptide levels is more likely than not, the showing of approximately 80% correlation for the molecules tested in the Polakis Declaration greatly exceed this legal standard. Based on these experimental data and his vast scientific experience of more than 20 years, Dr. Polakis states that, for human genes, increased mRNA levels typically correlate with an increase in abundance of the encoded protein. He further confirms that "it

remains a central dogma in molecular biology that increased mRNA levels are predictive of corresponding increased levels of the encoded protein."

Taken together, despite certain teachings in the art that some genes do not fit within this paradigm which are exceptions rather than the rule, in the vast majority of amplified genes, the combined teachings in the art exemplified by Orntoft *et al.*, Hyman *et al.* and Pollack *et al.*, and the Polakis declaration overwhelmingly teach that gene amplification influences gene expression at the mRNA and protein levels. Thus, one of skill in the art would reasonably expect, in this instance, based on the amplification data for the PRO232 gene, that the PRO232 protein is also concomitantly overexpressed.

In conclusion, the Examiner has not shown that a lack of correlation between gene amplification and polypeptide over-expression is typical, based on the Haynes reference. In fact, contrary to what the Examiner contends, even in Haynes *et al.*, **most genes** showed a correlation between increased mRNA : translated protein. Further, as discussed in detail above, the art itself indicates that if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is **more likely than not** that the encoded protein will be expressed at an elevated level, which is the utility standard.

**Claimed proteins would have diagnostic utility even if the protein were not overexpressed**

Even assuming *arguendo* that, there is no correlation between gene amplification and increased mRNA/protein expression for PRO232, which Applicants submit is not true, a polypeptide encoded by a gene that is amplified in cancer would **still** have a credible, specific and substantial utility, as indicated in the previous response, based on the previously submitted Declaration by Dr. Ashkenazi and further, is supported by the teachings of the attached article by Hanna and Mornin. As Dr. Avi Ashkenazi's Declaration explained in his declaration:

even when amplification of a cancer marker gene does not result in significant over-expression of the corresponding gene product, this very absence of gene product over-expression still provides significant information for cancer diagnosis and treatment. Thus, if over-expression of the gene product does not parallel gene amplification in certain tumor types but does so in others, then parallel monitoring of gene amplification and gene product over-expression enables more accurate tumor classification and hence better determination of suitable therapy. In addition, absence of over-expression is crucial information for the practicing clinician. If a gene is amplified but the corresponding gene

product is not over-expressed, the clinician accordingly will decide not to treat a patient with agents that target that gene product.

Applicants thus submit that simultaneous testing of gene amplification and gene product over-expression enables more accurate tumor classification, even if the gene-product, the protein, is not over-expressed. This leads to better determination of a suitable therapy. Further, as explained in Dr. Ashkenazi's Declaration, absence of over-expression of the protein itself is crucial information for the practicing clinician. If a gene is amplified in a tumor, but the corresponding gene product is not over-expressed, the clinician need not treat a patient with agents that target that gene product. This not only saves money, but further prevents unnecessary exposure of the patient to the side effects of gene product targeted agents.

This is further supported by the teachings of the attached article by Hanna and Mornin. The article teaches that the HER-2/neu gene has been shown to be amplified and/or over-expressed in 10%-30% of invasive breast cancers and in 40%-60% of intraductal breast carcinoma. Further, the article teaches that diagnosis of breast cancer includes testing both the amplification of the HER-2/neu gene (by FISH) as well as the over-expression of the HER-2/neu gene product (by IHC). Even when the protein is not over-expressed, the assay relying on both tests leads to a more accurate classification of the cancer and a more effective treatment of it.

In conclusion, Applicants have demonstrated a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility for the PRO232 polypeptide, for example, in detecting over-expression or absence of expression of PRO232. In fact, the art also indicates that, if a gene is amplified in cancer, it is **more likely than not** that the encoded protein will also be expressed at an elevated level. Based on these discussions, one skilled in the art, at the time the application was filed, would know how to use the claimed polypeptides.

Thus, Applicants have demonstrated utility for the PRO232 polypeptide. Hence, these data clearly support a role of PRO232 as a lung or colon tumor marker. Accordingly, the present 35 U.S.C. §101 and §112, first paragraph utility rejections should be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the recitation "soluble domain."

Without acquiescing to the propriety of these rejections, Applicants have canceled these recitations in the instant claims. Hence, these claims are now definite and this rejection should be withdrawn.

### **Priority**

Applicants rely on the gene amplification assay (Example 92) to establish patentable utility for the claimed polypeptide, PRO232. These results were first disclosed in U.S. Provisional Application 60/059121, filed September 17, 1997 and hence, as will be apparent from our discussions above, Applicants believe that it provides specific and substantial asserted utility for the claimed polypeptides in this invention. Thus, the present application is at least entitled to an effective filing date of **September 17, 1997**.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenthal (dated 28 October, 1999).

As discussed above, the pending claims are entitled to at least the effective filing date of September 17, 1997. The date of the cited primary reference is after the effective filing date of the present application. Hence, Rosenthal is not prior art under 102(b).

Hence Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

The present application is believed to be in *prima facie* condition for allowance, and an early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **08-1641**, referencing Attorney's Docket No. **39780-1618 P2C18**).

Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 6, 2004

By: Daphne Reddy  
Daphne Reddy (Reg. No. 53,507)

**HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & McAULIFFE LLP**

**Customer No. 35489**

275 Middlefield Road

Menlo Park, California 94025

Telephone: (650) 324-7000

Facsimile: (650) 324-0638

SV 2084916 v1  
12/6/04 10:34 AM (39780.1618)